

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

Mary Frangesh,

Civil No. 06-4951 (DWF/SRN)

Plaintiff,

v.

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT
AND RECOMMENDATION
AND MEMORANDUM**

John E. Potter, Postmaster General,

Defendant.

Mary Frangesh, *Pro Se*, Plaintiff.

Mary L. Trippler, Assistant United States Attorney, United States Attorney's Office,
counsel for Defendant.

This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiff Mary Frangesh's ("Plaintiff") self-styled objections to Magistrate Judge Susan Richard Nelson's Report and Recommendation dated October 19, 2007, recommending that Defendant John E. Potter's Motion for Summary Judgment be granted and that this case be dismissed with prejudice.

The Court has conducted a *de novo* review of the record, including a review of Plaintiff's arguments and submissions, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Rule 72.1(c). The factual background for the above-entitled matter is clearly and precisely set forth in the Report and Recommendation and is incorporated by reference for purposes of Plaintiff's objections.

Based upon the *de novo* review of the record and all of the arguments and submissions of the parties and the Court being otherwise duly advised in the premises, the Court hereby enters the following:

ORDER

1. Plaintiff Mary Frangesh's self-styled objections (Doc. No. 28) to Magistrate Judge Susan Richard Nelson's Report and Recommendation dated October 19, 2007, are **DENIED**.

2. Magistrate Judge Susan Richard Nelson's Report and Recommendation dated October 19, 2007 (Doc. No. 27), is **ADOPTED**.

3. Defendant John E. Potter's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 18) is **GRANTED** and this case is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

LET JUDGMENT BE ENTERED ACCORDINGLY.

Dated: November 27, 2007

s/Donovan W. Frank
DONOVAN W. FRANK
Judge of United States District Court

MEMORANDUM

Sadly, the Court observes that the Plaintiff strongly asserted that she has been adversely affected by a biased court system, including a biased Court. In fact, the Plaintiff has suggested that the lawyers and judges involved should be "disbarred and

removed from their legal duties.” In essence, the Plaintiff asserts, for a number of reasons, that she has not been treated fairly by the Court.

Apart from the Court’s decision on the merits and how it is viewed from those involved in the case and those looking from afar, the system is always damaged when a citizen appearing before a judge feels they have been treated unjustly from start to finish. With Plaintiff’s allegations in mind, this Court has carefully scrutinized the record and conducted a *de novo* review of the record, as noted, and concludes that the Plaintiff’s objections must be overruled. Consequently, the Court has adopted the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Susan Richard Nelson. The Court therefore grants Defendant John E. Potter’s Motion for Summary Judgment and respectfully dismisses Plaintiff’s case with prejudice. If the Plaintiff has any questions about her constitutional rights or remedies, she should consult with a lawyer or a person that she trusts and confides in.

D.W.F.